



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/730,980

12/10/2003

Gerard Gieux

L741.03111

5130

7590 07/03/2007
STEVENS, DAVIS, MILLER & MOSHER, L.L.P.
Suite 850
1615 L Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20036

EXAMINER

LE, HUYEN D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3751

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/03/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/730,980

Applicant(s)

GIEUX, GERARD

Examiner

Huyen Le

Art Unit

3751

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 June 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 3-15, 17, 21 and 22 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 16, 18-20 and 23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DE 3938347 in view of Miller (3,682,558).

The DE 3938347 reference discloses an applicator, capable of dispensing and storing powder, including: a reservoir 3, a storage section comprising very open synthetic foam pad 9 between the reservoir and a porous membrane 4, the porous membrane 4 of synthetic (plastic) foam tensioned over the reservoir 3 (see translation p. 11) which is much less open than the foam of the pad 9 (see Fig. 1).

Although the DE 3938347 reference does not disclose that the grid includes a plurality of orifices, attention is directed to the Miller reference which teaches another power applicator comprising a screen 30 having a plurality of orifices disposed between a reservoir 22 and a pad 26.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a grip having a plurality of orifices between the reservoir 3 and the pad of the DE 3938347 applicator in view of the teaching of Miller for filtering out the large particles of the material that may cause a clogging problem.

3. Claims 16 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DE 3938347 view of Miller (3,682,558) as described above and further in view of Weihrauch (6,685,376).

Regarding claim 16, the DE 3938347 reference discloses an applicator as discussed supra, but does not disclose that the foam pad is mushroom shaped. However, the Weihrauch reference discloses a similar applicator wherein the applicator is mushroom shaped to maximize the application surface area (see Figure 4).

It would have been obvious to modify the DE 3938347 applicator to have a mushroom shaped foam pad in view of Weihrauch to maximize the application surface area.

Regarding claim 18, the DE 3938347 reference discloses an applicator as discussed supra, but does not disclose that the exterior of the membrane is flocked. However, the Weihrauch reference discloses a similar applicator wherein the outer surface of the applicator is flocked (see col. 8, lines 55-57) to improve transfer of product from the applicator to the surface.

It would have been obvious to modify the DE 3938347 applicator so that the outer surface of the membrane is flocked in view of Weihrauch to improve transfer of product from the applicator to the surface.

4. Claims 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DE 3938347 view of Miller (3,682,558) as described above.

The DE 3938347 reference discloses an applicator as discussed supra, but remains silent as to the diameter and distribution of the pores in the pad. However, it

Art Unit: 3751

would have been obvious to employ a pad having pores of a diameter and distribution within the claimed ranges, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. In re Aller, 105 USPQ 2336.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments on 06/08/2007 with respect to claim 1 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Huyen Le whose telephone number is 571-272-4890. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:00 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Huson can be reached on 571-272-4887. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3751

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Huyen Le
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3751

HL